

Date: Sat, 15 May 93 08:30:21 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #589
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 15 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 589

Today's Topics:

AMTOR question
CFV to reorganize this group (2 msgs)
Experience with Ramsey Kits?
G5RV
Ham <-> Internet email?
Looking for simple synthesizer design
Old tubes for sale... Check it out!
question about Radio Shack 2-MTR HT
Radio Shack 70cm HT? (2 msgs)
Re: CFV to reorganize this group (rec.radio.amateur.*)
REQUEST: Repeater Frequencies
What is circular polarization?
Why do they DO that? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 15:36:14 GMT
From: pipex!uknet!mcsun!sun4nl!bsoatr!bsdihi!dihi@uunet.uu.net
Subject: AMTOR question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

What you hear is probably the new mode called PACTOR

Dick Hissink PA3DSP
Email:dihi@bsdihi.atr.bso.nl

Date: 15 May 1993 00:12:00 GMT
From: sun-barr!west.West.Sun.COM!11-a!flloyd@ames.arpa
Subject: CFV to reorganize this group
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>with 100 "yes" votes, 0 "no" votes (and 40,000 abstentions)."
>
>Did the ratios of yes's to abstentions change all that much?
>
>If you like things mostly the way they currently are, your only choice is to
>vote "NO" for all of those groups that you don't wish to vote "yes" for. It
>gives your vote more power.
>
>-----
>Chuck Harris - WA3UQV

Well Chuck, I think that most of us have resigned to the fact that
the whiners WILL get their way. I voted NO last time and it passed
anyway so.....

Let's hear it for:

rec.radio.my.vote.is.worthless
rec.radio.amateur.nite
rec.radio.no-code.destiny
rec.radio.five.kilowatts.in.a.honda
rec.radio.it.tastes.like.chicken
rec.radio.HTX202.mods
rec.radio.hit.the.n.key.now
rec.radio.license.delays
rec.radio.real.hams.gasping
rec.radio.underwater.t-hunting
rec.radio.chicken.choking
rec.radio.military.ban.on.cw
rec.radio.200.watt.cb.swap
rec.radio.HTX202.mods (in case you missed the first one)
rec.radio.info-hams.bounced
rec.radio.cellular.favorite

-fred

[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ
[Sun Microsystems,
[Phoenix, AZ

Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
Systems Engineer]
(602) 224-3517]

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 04:37:28 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CFV to reorganize this group
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:

:

: I think we're still miscommunicating on something here. It is possible to
: abstain on a single newsgroup while casting votes for the ones you have an
: opinion on. The ballot form in the CFV allows for separate votes on each

Can you imagine anyone in r.r.a.* that doesn't have an opinion on
anything? ;-).

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 19:47:48 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!
cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!Freenet.carleton.ca!ae517@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Experience with Ramsey Kits?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I built the FX-146 rig and the only problem I had was one hole in the PCB that was
not drilled out. It worked as soon as I put power to it. I built a EPROM cct
from 73 magazine to give direct freq input, that worked fine too!
73 de ve3uav

--
Russ Renaud
ae517@freenet.carleton.ca

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 00:14:11 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srgenprp!
alanb@ames.arpas
Subject: G5RV
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

gary mcduffle (mcduffle@unl.edu) wrote:

: ... I defy all the advice
: in the books/articles to get it into the house though. I use a Radio
: Works Balun just outside the shack window and feed it with 16 feet of
: 9913 coax (just what was handy). The texts all say to use a minimum of
: xx feet of coax and most say not to use a balun.

IMHO the coax length requirement is pure witchcraft. The length of
the coax will make no difference if there is no feedline radiation.
Of course, there likely WILL be feedline radiation since you are feeding
a balanced antenna with unbalanced coax, but the proper length of coax to
reduce unwanted shield currents is hard to determine -- it will depend on
how your equipment is hooked up and grounded. If feedline radiation
causes problems, just add a current-type balun between twinlead and coax.

AL N1AL

Date: 12 May 93 14:56:59 GMT
From: ucla-mic!unixg.ubc.ca!cs.ubc.ca!destroyer!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!
ira.uka.de!uka!iraull!mvb05@locus.ucla.edu
Subject: Ham <-> Internet email?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello,

in the centre of amateur radio are experiments. Persons who want to use
amateur radio have to take an exam concerning technological aspects,
national and international law, how to operate and for the higher
classes Morse. If they pass the exam, they will get a call. From this
call you can see the country and the class of their licence. With the
call they can work from 1.8 mhz up to 24 ghz. There are a lot of
possibilities to make contacts by using these frequencies. One of these
are transmitting and receiving digital information - so called packet

radio. So to speak it is not a tecnological problem, but it could be a problem of the ligality.

To dicus this aspect I would in this special case contact the ARRL, wich is an amarican association of radio hams.

My best regards

Marcus Poepping (DF1DV)

his

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 00:16:35 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srgegenp!alanb@ames.arpa
Subject: Looking for simple synthesizer design
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Alan Bloom (alanb@sr.hp.com) wrote:

: Years ago, when synthesized radios first started coming out, there was
: a kit made by GLB Electronics that did exactly what you want. ...

: It used a separate set of thumbwheels for transmit and receive,

I meant rotary switches, not thumbwheels.

AL N1AL

Date: 10 May 93 10:30:57 MDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!slmdj@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Old tubes for sale... Check it out!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Our local Civil Air Patrol squadron has come across a bunch of old tubes, and I got nominated for the honors of selling them. All profits will go to the Cache Valley Composite Squadron, for the purpose of building an aircraft hangar...

I will accept bids through 12 noon MDT on 17 May, 1993. The highest bidder will be notified shortly after to arrange shipping and payment methods. Bids should NOT include the cost of shipping, as that will be figured after, and will depend on the method of shipping, and to some extent, the number of tubes you want. Once received by you, all sales will be final, but all tubes should be in good working order, as we sorted through them and removed any with problems (there were only two...)

You may bid for any number of tubes, but larger quantities are preferred. Send your bid, along with the number listed and your return e-mail address to me:

Paul Cowley
slmdj@cc.usu.edu

This list is roughly sorted by envelope size, and the final section of the list contains some that are known to be transmitting type tubes...

All tubes have glass envelopes...

Mini's

Tube Number:	Quantity:	Tube Number:	Quantity:
12AU7	13	6AH6	3
5760	20	6AU6	2
5687	35	5726	5
5847	6	5125	1
6AL5	5	2021	1
5814A	8	6AK5	4
0A2	6	5654	5
6141	2	12AU6	1
0B2	4	6J6	2
5842	1	6AS6	2
412A	2	5725	4
6AN5	1	12BE6	1
2C51	7	12AX7	2
12BA6	1	5844	2
12BF6	1	5727	1
6189	1		

Mediums:

Tube Number:	Quantity:	Tube Number:	Quantity:
6AR6	7	5693	4
25Z5	1	5U4	1
5Z3	2	6AS7	5
5Y3	1		

Large/Transmitter:

Tube Number:	Quantity:	Tube Number:	Quantity:
371-B	5	813	2
100TH	2	4B31	4
6D6	2	807	2
8020	2	6901	5
5C22	1	393A	1

- -

Paul Cowley
==EE Undergrad==
Utah State University
C/TSgt Utah Wing CAP
slmdj@cc.usu.edu | If entropy is increasing,
where is it coming from?
(E-mail your best response to me if you want!) :-)

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 20:01:13 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!unixhub!111-winken.llnl.gov!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!psinntp!gdstech!gdstech!bat@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: question about Radio Shack 2-MTR HT
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

You guys are bemoaning your computer interference to your HTs with ducky antennas. Gary, and the other people are telling you to use a real (outside, and high) antenna to cure that problem. It will. And, it will cure a problem that you are causing me (and other packeteers). The dreaded HIDDEN TRANSMITTER problem.

If you are close enough to the BBS to get into it on an HT with a ducky, then you probably can't hear most of the distant packet stations in your region. And, they can't hear you, either. But, the BBS, with its high antenna, hears us both, and often at the SAME TIME. The result is, that neither your packets, or mine, are decoded, and both systems go into backoff/retry mode.

Throughput degrades. We all lose. The solution is for ALL antennas to be high, and transmitters running 20 watts minimum. (easy for me, I'm rich). In packet, the ideal state is for all the systems to be able to hear ALL the other ones on the frequency (within realistic limits). Please do what you can to contribute to the health of the system as a whole, and not just concern yourself with your own situation. -pat

—

* Pat Masterson D12-25 | KE2LJ@KC2FD *
* Grumman Data Systems | 516-346-6316. *
* Bethpage, NY 11746 | bat@gdstech.grumman.com *

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 19:19:06 GMT
From: chapman@cu-arpad.cs.cornell.edu
Subject: Radio Shack 70cm HT?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

coulson@rwcyyx.enet.dec.com (Roger Coulson) writes:

>In article <1993May14.151046.22174@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:
>|>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
>|>From: markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger)
>|>Subject: Radio Shack 70cm HT?
>|>Organization: SPS
>|>Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 15:10:46 GMT
>|>Lines: 6
>|>
>|>I saw a packet posting yesterday about a Radio Shack 70cm HT. Supposedly
>|>they are starting to sell them. The poster gave a model number and a
>|>price...\$299.95. Sounded like a 70cm version of the 2M one. Anyone here
>|>know anything about it?
>|>
>|>Mark AA7TA
>|>

>Radio Shack is now carrying a two channel 1 watt GMRS HT. It is on 2 of the
>462 MHZ interstitial channels. It is carrier squelch only. It is xtal
>controlled. It is definitely NOT suitable for amateur service.

Yes, they do sell that radio , but they also have a forthcoming
(when?) 70cm radio much like the HTX-202, according to the guide to
HT's in the CQ "Beginners Guide" magazine, currently available at
newsstands. There is about a 5 column-inch description of the radio
in that article.

73 de KC4IFB

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 03:39:16 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!concert!
samba!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Radio Shack 70cm HT?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May14.151046.22174@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com
writes:
>I saw a packet posting yesterday about a Radio Shack 70cm HT. Supposedly
>they are starting to sell them. The poster gave a model number and a
>price...\$299.95. Sounded like a 70cm version of the 2M one. Anyone here
>know anything about it?
>

Someone told me it looked and had the same features as the HTX-202 (Which I

consider to be a great HT), only on 440. I believe my local RS has one in stock, and I think I'll drive down and check it out tomorrow.

73 Scott KM6ZD

--
The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNChpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 23:19:50 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
hplextra!hpfcs0!hplvec!scott@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Re: CFV to reorganize this group (rec.radio.amateur.*)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, pschleck@cwis.unomaha.edu (Paul W Schleck KD3FU) writes:

> I must hasten to point out that there are actually 11 proposals, each
> requiring an individual "no" (or yes or abstain) vote. If you think there
> are too many groups, I encourage you to vote yes for the ones that you
> want, and at least abstain from voting against the ones you don't care
> about ("no" votes should be reserved for newsgroups that you think would
> be detrimental to Usenet).

ARGHHHH!!!! Please vote the way you feel you should vote. Yes means yes, no means no and abstain means don't care. My guess is that for most of the readers of these groups those terms are self-explanatory.

Doggone it Paul, if you feel as I do that there are *WAY TOO MANY GROUPS* the best way to keep the divisions from happening is to vote no on the groups you don't want. That's exactly what I intend to do, and it's what I would encourage others to do as well.

I'll assume your directions are well-intended, but from where I stand if people follow your rules it almost guarantees passage of the new groups. That's something many here simply don't want. Was that your intent?

Let's keep this thing fair and allow people to vote for, against or abstain as they choose. The amount of work that went into these proposals should be appreciated, but is irrelevant to the voting process. Let the groups stand or fall on their own merits.

BTW, I personally do believe that this recent trend to excessively subdivide groups is detrimental to Usenet *users*.

I'll be voting no.

PS I picked on Paul's posting, but a similar one from Ian Kluft carried an almost identical message.

Scott Turner N0VRF scott@hpisla.LVLD.HP.COM
HP VXI Systems Division

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 19:02:44 EDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.cac.psu.edu!psuvm!axh113@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: REQUEST: Repeater Frequencies
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi,

I am travelling to Washington D.C. from State College PA. Could anyone please provide me with some repeater freq. along the way, or please, the repeater freq. in the D.C. area. Ok, thanks.

Please reply to my account at axh113@psuvm.psu.edu.

-Azmi, N30DN

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 23:29:40 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntp2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: What is circular polarization?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

cvm@zippy.telcom.arizona.edu (Chris Michels) writes:

>1 - Circular polarization is just the result of satellites spinning and
>has no real benefit.

The spinning causes spin modulation, not circular polarization. They'd have to spin ***really*** fast to be circularly polarizing a VHF/UHF signal. But think about what would happen if they used linear polarization? At some points in time, your receiving antenna (assuming it is also linearly polarized) and the satellites antenna would be aligned properly and you'd get the most gain. Now the satellite rotates 1/4 turn and now the antenna's signal is 90 degrees rotated from your receiving antenna. There

would be around 20 dB drop in signal strength! That would make for some severe QSB.

With circularly polarized signals, the signal's polarization remains the same no matter how much the satellite rotates (as long as the axis of rotation and the forward lobe of the antenna are aligned.) So no QSB, at least due to polarity shifts.

>2 - Circular polarization is intentional and allows ground stations to >not worry about the polarization of their antenna because the circular >polarized signal will be oriented acceptably at least 50% of the time.

Close, the signal will be acceptably oriented 100% of the time, provided the main lobe of the antenna is pointing towards your station. Another way to say that is the squint angle (or off point angle) is very low. When working a side lobe of the satellite, then the polarity may reverse which is why you sometimes get a better signal with an antenna that can switch between left hand and right hand circular polarization. You tend to get greater spin modulation when working a side lobe because there will be nulls between the side lobes that are aimed your direction when the satellite rotates. This typically means that during the early and late portions of the orbit, the spin modulation is greatest and the polarization is often reversed.

>More questions, how does using a circularly polarized antenna help. If >#2 above is true, then a fixed polarized antenna would be acceptable. >If this is not true, then how does a circularly polarized antenna know >at what rate and orientation to spin the polarization. Does the >polarization make one revolution per wave or does it not matter? It >seems that if the polarization of the signal and the receiving antenna >were changing at the same rate but were 90 degrees out of phase, then >the signal would be missed/lost.

Hmmm lets see how to describe this. The signal makes one complete rotation in one cycle, so the satellite doesn't "spin" the polarization, the signal is polarized. The satellite could use a linearly polarized antenna and generate circular polarization if it managed to rotate and the frequency of operation. That would be pretty fast ;-)

You can use a linearly polarized antenna on your ground station and take a 3 dB loss since only half the signal will be polarized correctly.

>I hope I have worded these questions appropriately. I can visualize >circular polarization, but am not sure about the technical terms used to >describe it.

I hope I've described it in easy enough terms (and haven't introduced any inaccuracies.)

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 14 May 93 18:25:49 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!
yee@ames.arpa
Subject: Why do they DO that?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>I have been reading quite a lot here about how various HT's and scanners and
>such are modify-able. As the HTs are concerned, a user may modify the radio to
>transmit outside of designated amateur bands.

The short answer is market forces. Hams want to out of band transmission and
are willing to pay for it.

An HT with a wider out of band capability has an edge in marketing. We probably
all know a ham or two who have said, "buy X instead of Y since X has wider out
of band transmit/receive."

--
411 Blockley Hall | Conway Yee, N2JWQ
418 Service Drive | yee@ming.mipg.upenn.edu (preferred)
Philadelphia, PA 19104 | cy5@cunixa.cc.columbia.edu (forwarded to above)
(215) 662-6780 |

Date: 14 May 1993 22:39:23 GMT
From: sun-barr!west.West.Sun.COM!11-a!flloyd@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Why do they DO that?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May13.162900.117@muvms6.wvnet.edu> rcomm@muvms6.wvnet.edu writes:
>I have been reading quite a lot here about how various HT's and scanners and
>such are modify-able. As the HTs are concerned, a user may modify the radio to
>transmit outside of designated amateur bands. My question is WHY do
>manufacturers knowingly engineer and manufacture radios that can do this? Is
>it to satisfy the ham's incurable urge to tinker? (i.e. they know hams are
>going to mess with something, so they provide 'hidden' features so that messers
>don't REALLY mess up their radio!) Or is there some practical reason that
>prevents them from engineering a synthesized-tuning radio that can only
>synthesize ham freqs from the chip level? WHY? WHY? WHY?

>
>Just wondering...
>

It's much simpler than you think. Let me see now... where's that old soap box... Okay, here it is :-)

First of all, there are several major amateur markets in the world. The US market is NOT the largest, it's the second largest with Japan coming in first with nearly twice as many hams.

In order for a radio to be profitable, it must be saleable in all of the worlds major markets. There are perhaps a dozen of them in all. Each of these markets has a different geography and each one has a different set of rules and regulations to abide by. In other words, there's a different band plan for each market.

So, your goal as a radio manufacturer is to design one and only one chip set which will work for all of the different markets. You do this in software since it's the easiest way to define arbitrary (legal) operating limits. Your next goal is to make sure that it is easy to manufacture units and when it comes time to adjust the production line for a batch for a different market, all you need to do is rearrange the pattern of diodes on the CPU board. It costs no more to rearrange a set of diodes and thus its a manufacturing success and guess what... we all get to buy incredibly cheap radios.

Well, that's it. Not much of a soap box. But I said that it was a simple answer....

-fred

[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ
[Sun Microsystems,
[Phoenix, AZ

Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
Systems Engineer]
(602) 224-3517]

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 00:18:12 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!ux4.cso.uiuc.edu!apeters2@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9305121559.AA00688@ginzo.wellfleet>, <C6xtu8.D2H@news.cso.uiuc.edu>, <1993May14.163344.16652@microsoft.com>uc.e
Subject : Re: question about Radio Shack 2-MTR HT

laurahal@microsoft.com (Laura Halliday) writes:

>I use an HTX202 as well, and have never had any interference or intermod
>problems. It has quite a sensitive front end, so if anything is making
>noise, you'll hear it; in my office it picks up S9 hash over most of
>2m, but with some very noisy computers in a steel-frame building,
>that's to be expected. It can even hear cable channel 18 (video
>carrier 145.25 MHz).

>You'll need to shield your computers to use the HTX202 on packet.
>Since my (true blue) PC is dead quiet anyway, I haven't had any
>interference, though I haven't tried packet with my 202 yet.

I have been using an HTX 202 on packet for quite a while and have had no problems with my home computer whitch is an 425 SX factory direct(or a GRID same thing). I have found a problem using it for portable packet with a laptop because of the RF interference and to fix it the antenna needs to be about fifteen to twenty feet away from the laptop.

>73 from Vancouver.

>...laura VE7LDH

AJP
N9ONI

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #589
